

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 4 and 30 have been amended as shown on pages 3-6 of the Reply. Claims 31 and 32 have been added. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated on page 2 of the reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection of Claim 4**

Claim 4 is objected for minor informality. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein.

**II. Rejection of Claim 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments herein.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-22, 25 and 27-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-22, 25 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Scharefer (US Pub 2003/0084429. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Scholl, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects of subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to system and methodology to facilitate user interface automation. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component based, at least in*

*part, upon information stored in a map information store and information stored in a command information store.* Scharefer neither teaches nor suggests such novel aspects.

Scharefer provides systems and methods for table driven automation testing for performing functional testing of a software program. The system includes a GUI translator component to translate one or more GUI maps into a set of database tables, a data input component to facilitate entry and editing of test case data in the tables, and a test engine component for executing the software program based on a test case stored in the tables. At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner incorrectly contends that Scharefer teaches *a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component.* The cited portion of reference provides for a GUI translator component to translate one or more GUI maps into a set of database tables, a data input component to facilitate creation of one or more test cases, which are input as data into the tables by the data input component (Paragraph 37, lines 3-6). The test engine component queries the tables to retrieve data for a test case and use one or more GUI maps along with the data for test case to call a function in the software controller. The software controller component receives instructions and data from the test engine component and transmits instructions and data to the software program thereby controlling the execution of software program (Paragraph 38). Hence Scharefer provides for table driven automation testing of a software program by translating one or more GUI maps into a set of database tables by a GUI translator component and then querying the tables to retrieve data for a test. However Scharefer nowhere teaches or suggests *a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component.* According to system provided by Scharefer, the user needs to have substantial knowledge of functionality associated with the system to create UI automation which consumes a sizable amount of time. The present application mitigates creation time by providing *navigation component* and *simulated user interface* that facilitates the user to create UI automation without any substantial knowledge of functionality associated with the system.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is clear that Scharefer fails to teach each and every aspect recited in the subject claims. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**IV. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharefer. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Scharefer relates to table driven automation testing for performing functional testing of a software program and does not teach or suggest every limitations with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 4 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 4 is not obvious over Scharefer. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

**V. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharefer in view of Minard (US Patent 6,247,020). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scharefer and Minard either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Minard relates to development system with application browser user interface and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Scharefer with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 2 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 2 is not obvious over the combination of Scharefer and Minard. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

**VI. Rejection of Claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharefer in view of Zimniewiez *et al.* (US Patent 6,744,450), hereinafter “Zimniewiez. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Scharefer and Zimniewiez either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Zimniewiez relates to system and method for providing multiple installation actions and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Scharefer with respect to independent claim 1 (from which claim 12 and 13 depend), 22 (from which claim 23 depends) and independent claim 25 (from which claim 26 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 is not obvious over the combination of

Scharefer and Zimniewiez. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP462US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,  
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/  
Himanshu S. Amin  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731